DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 710 HE 014 295

AUTHOR Webster, David S.
TITLE Chicano Students in American Higher Education--A Review of the Literature.
PUB DATE 1 Aug 81
NOTE 55p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; *College Students; Enrollment Influences; *Enrollment Trends; Ethnic Studies; Grade Point Average; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Mexican Americans; Population Distribution; Predictor Variables; Professional Education; Student Attitudes; Student Attrition; Student Characteristics; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS Chicanas; *Chicanos

ABSTRACT

Literature on Chicano students in American higher education is reviewed and criticized. The following topics are addressed: the difficulty of defining "Chicano;" problems in working with Chicano census data; the United State Chicano population in terms of age, family size, as a percentage of all United States Hispanics, and geographical distribution; higher education for Chicanos in the United States before and after 1970; Chicano studies programs and centers; and colleges attended by large numbers of Chicanos. In this report Chicano is used to refer to those who came to the United States from Mexico. Statistics on Chicanos in high school and factors that have been cited as contributing to limited access of Chicanos to higher education, including selectivity, tuition expense, inadequate programs, transfer problems, and inadequate information, are examined. Once Chicano students enter college, empirical findings suggest that they drop out more often than do other students, tend to major and earn degrees in fields requiring less quantitative rigor than do other students, and go on to graduate and professional school less often than do other students. It is claimed that these facts suggest that the standard predictors of college success do not work very well for Chicano students. Enrollment statistics of Chicanos in higher education are cited in terms of level of enrollment, types of schools attended, and regions of the country. Literature on Chicano grade point averages, attrition, graduate and professional school attendance, and affective and emotional qualities is examined. A bibliography is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208710

CHICANO STUDENTS IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION --
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David S. Webster

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

David S. Webster
Assistant Professor of
Higher Education
University of Pennsylvania
August 1, 1981

HE 014 295

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Difficulty of Defining "Chicano".....1

Problems in Working with Chicano Census Data.....2

The United States Chicano Population.....4

Age.....5

Family Size.....5

As a Percentage of All United States Hispanics.....6

Geographical Distribution.....6

Brief History of Higher Education for Chicanos in the United States before 1970.....7

Chicanos' Participation in American Higher Education 1970 to the Present.....8

High School Attendance and Graduation.....9

Access to College.....11

Predictors of Chicano College Success.....14

College Enrollment.....16

Grade Point Averages.....21

Attrition Rates.....22

Chicanos in Graduate and Professional School.....24

Affective and Emotional Qualities.....28

Chicano Studies Programs and Centers.....33

Colleges Attended by Large Numbers of Chicanos.....39

The Literature about Chicanos in American Higher Education -- a Critique.....43

References.....47

THE DIFFICULTY OF DEFINING "CHICANO"

One of the problems of doing research about chicanos[1] in American higher education, or on chicanos in general, is the difficulty in defining them, and in distinguishing them from the many other groups of people who have backgrounds of Spanish language and culture. As the National Center for Educational Statistics' The Condition of Education for Spanish Americans puts it:

> A major source of difficulty arises in the operational definitions used in identifying Hispanic Americans from variations over time, and among data collection agencies. For example, the Census Bureau has variously counted Hispanic Americans as: "Spanish-speaking immigrants" (1850); persons speaking Spanish as a "mother tongue" (1910); persons who identified themselves as being of the "Mexican race" ("all persons born in Mexico or having parents born in Mexico who are not definitely White, Negro, Indian, Chinese or Japanese") (1930); persons with "Spanish surnames" in the southwestern states (1950); persons with a combination of Hispanic birth or parentage, Spanish mother tongue, and Spanish surname (1960); and persons of "Spanish origin or descent" (1970). These varying categories make it impossible to calculate long term Hispanic population trends or to separate data into the various Hispanic subgroups: Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Spanish origins (11, pp. 1-2).

Likewise, the compilers of the most comprehensive bibliography ever assembled on chicanos in American higher education -- it lists 774 items -- warn their readers:

> Among the labels used variously and inconsistently

---

[1]The term "chicano" is sometimes used to refer to all Americans with Spanish language and/or Spanish culture backgrounds and sometimes used to refer to just those who came to the United States from Mexico. In this report chicano is used in the second, more restrictive sense and refers to only those who came to America from Mexico.

> by authors in this bibliography to describe chicanos are such generic terms as Spanish-speaking, Spanish surnamed, Spanish heritage, and Spanish origin; Hispano or Hispanic American, Latino or Latin American, and Spanish or Spanish American (4, p. 1, fn.)

And Arce, in another publication, laments that statistics for chicanos often cannot be separated from the statistics on other people of Spanish backgrounds, making it extremely difficult to know how chicanos are faring in American society:

> The use of "Spanish-surname" as an aggregate category encompassing people of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban and other Latin American origin is misleading and precludes the generation of separate participation profiles for Chicanos, who have educational attainment rates much lower than Blacks, and Cuban Americans, who have educational attainment rates about equal to that of whites (3, p. 170).

PROBLEMS IN WORKING WITH CHICANO CENSUS DATA

Another difficulty in dealing with statistics on chicanos is that the Census Bureau, up until and including the 1970 census, did not provide very reliable data about them.[2] A comprehensive study of the 1970 census' techniques and results in gathering information on people of Spanish-speaking backgrounds reported, among many other criticisms, that US census officials:

a. made no effort to include persons of Spanish-speaking

---

[2] From all reports, the 1980 census avoided many of the faults of earlier ones, but its results are not yet available. Indeed, it has been difficult to find reliable recent statistics on chicanos in American higher education -- much of the data discussed here are from 1976, 1974 and even earlier, possibly because in the last years of a decade, social scientists may slow their efforts to collect data on topics covered in any extensive way by the decennial census, anticipating that in a year or two they will be able to work with the census data.

background on advisory committees in conjunction with the census' preparation;

b. drew up mailing lists from commercial lists of such persons as property tax payers, therefore probably excluding some taxpayers of Spanish-speaking background;

c. made only a slight effort to hire bilingual census takers;

d. did not hire enough bilingual community education specialists;

e. failed to send a sample bilingual or Spanish questionnaire to people in every area where large numbers of people of Spanish background lived (20).

Similarly, Michael Olivas laments the errors of the census in dealing with chicanos and others of Spanish background:

> Undercounting, sampling errors in minority populations, reluctance of enumerators to poll minority households or inability to speak Spanish all work against Hispanic interests in accurate counts (61, p. 16).

In California alone, the census data in 1970 undercounted Spanish-Americans by more than half a million people:

> ...The Mexican-American Population Commission Report of October 1970 stated that the Census figures underenumerated the figure for Spanish-Americans in the State by at least 643,000, and the Census report subsequently became the subject of debate and legal action. Partly as a result of such action, the Census Bureau announced, in March 1974, that it had undercounted California Chicanos by more than 643,000 (65, p. 12).

And the census data are not the only set of figures that undercount or simply ignore the chicano presence in America. Antonia Lopez, speaking at the California Governor's Chicana

conference in June, 1980, bitterly commented on California's inadequate record-keeping on chicanas:

> We don't exist...to the department of the aging; we have no old people. There are no statistics in the department of corrections; they don't know how many of us are incarcerated or for what.
>
> Education -- they don't know anything except we're dropping out at a 50% rate....
>
> Mental health -- they don't know. We don't have any mentally ill.
>
> A lot of government itself simply has not documented us (72, part 5, p. 1).

So because of the difficulties in defining "chicano," the inadequacy of U.S. census data, and the dearth of records about many important aspects of their lives, any figures about chicanos must be regarded cautiously. With this caveat in mind, let us look at some data on the chicano population of the United States.

THE UNITED STATES CHICANO POPULATION

To examine the statistics on chicanos in the United States is to understand how subjected they have been to generations of discrimination and neglect. No matter what indicators one looks at, they are either at or very near the bottom of our social order. According to the 1970 United States census figures on chicanos:

> ...a disproportionate number (26.6%) live "in poverty" ...the majority work in jobs that are menial and low paying...76% are classified as blue-collar workers... they have less formal education that either the Anglo or Black population. In summary, the Mexican American is typically a poor, urban dweller, with less formal education than other groups in our society, and performs jobs at the lower level of organizations (56, p. 21).

Age

According to the March and October, 1974 Current Population Surveys of the Bureau of the Census:

> Chicanos are young as a group, with a median age in March 1974 of 18.9 years, compared with 19.8 years for Puerto Ricans, 22.8 for blacks, 29.3 for whites and 35.7 for Cubans (2, p. 15).

By 1978, chicanos, though somewhat older as a group than in 1974, with a median age of 21.3 years, were still one of the very youngest groups in the United States, and still much younger than whites, whose median age had increased to 30.6 years old (11, TAble 1.06, p. 16).

Family Size

According to 1974 census data:

> Chicano youth and children are more likely than any other group to live in larger families with both mother and father present. The median number of persons in Chicano families is 4.39, versus 3.44 for the total population. Over 49% of Chicano families have 5 or more persons, compared with 32% for blacks, 21% for whites, and 29% for Puerto Ricans. Eighty-five percent of all Chicano families have both husband and wife present compared to 62% for blacks and 66% for Puerto Ricans. The corresponding figure for the total population is 86% (1, p. 79).

By 1978, census data show that chicanos' family size, although smaller than in 1974, was still larger than that for almost every other group. Chicanos' family size was 4.1 members, compared to 3.8 for Puerto Ricans, 3.5 for Cubans, 3.5 for all Hispanics (other than chicanos, Puerto Ricans and Cubans) as a group, and 3.3 for all non-Hispanics as a group. And 34.7% of all chicano families had 5 or more children, still higher than almost every other group -- by comparison, 29.3% of all Puerto

Rican families had five or more children, 18.3% of all Cuban families, and 22.6% of all other Hispanics as a group, and only 18.3% of all non-Hispanic families (11, Table 1.07, p. 18).

As a Percentage of all United States Hispanics

Chicanos constitute well over half of all Hispanics living in the United States. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, based on 1978 census data:

> The largest subgroup (of U.S. Hispanics) is Mexican Americans, who number 7 million or 59% of all Hispanic Americans. Puerto Ricans number 1.8 million [15%], Central or South Americans, .9 million [8%], Cubans .7 million [6%], and "other Spanish" 1.5 million [13%] (11, p. 2).[3]

Geographical Distribution

According to data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics in 1976, there were 6,828,000 chicanos living in the United States. Of these, 2,745,000 lived in California, 2,480,000 in Texas, 319,000 in Arizona, 222,000 in Illinois, 214,000 in New Mexico, and 211,000 in Colorado.[4] They are concentrated in a very small number of states; 84% of them live in only two states, California and Texas, and those two plus the other four states listed above account for fully

---

[3]The percentages for all sub-groups except "Mexican Americans" were calculated by the author from absolute numbers listed in the table.

[4]These figures were derived from Table 1.04, p. 12, of the National Center for Education Statistics' Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans. The numbers listed for Hispanics in the United States, state by state, were multiplied by the percentage of each number listed as being chicano and then rounded to the nearest thousand.

91% of them. All six states except Illinois are among the largest states, in terms of geographical area, in the United States.

BRIEF HISTORY OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR CHICANOS IN THE UNITED STATES BEFORE 1970

Before the early 1970s, the chicano presence, both in mainstream American colleges and universities and in the literature about these schools, was almost non-existent. Along with blacks and American Indians, they are the invisible men and women of American higher education. From 1920-1945, the chicano enrollment at the University of Texas never rose as high as 2% of the total enrollment (27, p. 62). From 1928-1945, only 271 chicanos earned a degree from the University of Texas, about 1.1% of all the degrees that university conferred in those years (73, p. 340).

Before World War II, not only were chicanos very sparse on American college campuses, but those who did attend college were often treated very condescendingly (73, p. 341). In the early 1940s, for example, professors at the University of New Mexico instituted a dual system of marking, under which chicanos were not expected to perform as well as Anglos, and they were totally excluded from fraternities and sororities (75, pp. 298; 306).

After World War II, the GI Bill let some chicano servicemen enter college, and by 1958, "California enrolled nearly 36,000 college freshmen of Mexican-American origin, several thousand more than in Texas" (73, p. 341). In the Southwestern states as

a group, chicanos made up nearly 6% of all entering freshmen (though, because of their high attrition rates, a considerably smaller proportion of college upperclassmen and, especially, graduates) (53, p. 59).

In 1966, San Fernando Valley State College (California) enrolled only seven chicano students (73, p. 343). By 1967, chicanos still made up only 3% of the enrollment at the University of Texas (73, p. 343). In 1968, only 2.3% of UCLA's undergraduate enrollment was chicano (70, p. 5). Only in the early 1970s did chicanos start making sizeable enrollment gains in mainstream American colleges and universities.

CHICANOS' PARTICIPATION IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION, 1970 TO THE PRESENT

As in virtually all other areas of American life, chicanos are exceptionally disadvantaged in higher education; as a University of California report on the status of chicanos in that university stated:

> Because of unequal opportunities and discriminatory educational policies and practices, Chicanos, next to Native Americans, are the most educationally disadvantaged of all ethnic groups in the nation (65, p. 35).

Discrimination against the neglect of chicanos starts in their earliest years of schooling. The United States Civil Service Commission, after a lengthy study, concluded:

> The findings of this report reflect more than inadequacies regarding the specific conditions and practices examined. They reflect a systematic failure of the educational process, which not only ignores the educational needs of Chicano students but also suppresses their culture and stifles their hopes and ambitions (71, p. 67).

High School Attendance and Graduation

Before turning to data on chicanos' participation in higher education -- since high school participation and completion inevitably help determine rates of college admission and attendance -- we will look briefly at some statistics on chicanos in high school.

Historically, fewer chicanos have attended high school than almost any other American ethnic group. On April 1, 1960, 26% of all 15, 16, and 17 year old chicano males were not enrolled in high school, compared with 25% of Puerto Ricans, 21% of blacks, 18% of whites, and only 2% of Japanese. Only American Indian males had a higher rate of high school non-attendance (29%) than did chicanos. By 1970, chicano males had improved their high school non-attendance somewhat, both in absolute rates and relative to other ethnic groups. Only 13% did not attend, compared to 26% of Puerto Ricans, 16% of blacks, and 15% of American Indian non-attenders; chicanos were still well behind whites, though, of whom only 9% did not attend. In 1976, 11% of chicano males did not attend high school, compared to 7% of blacks, 5% of whites, and only 2% of Japanese; in 1976, only American Indians had a higher rate of high school non-attendance than chicanos.

Chicano women, too, have been at or near the bottom of all American ethnic groups in terms of high school attendance rates. As of April 1, 1960, 31% of all 15, 16, and 17 year old chicanas were not attending high school, the highest rate for any ethnic group; by comparison, 30% of Puerto Ricans, 24% of American

Indians, 23% of blacks, 12% of whites, and only 3% of Japanese were not attending. By 1970, chicanas, with 17% non-attendance, had surpassed Puerto Ricans (26%), but still lagged slightly behind American Indians (16%) and blacks (15%), and far behind whites (8%) and Japanese (6%). By 1976, chicanas (14% non-attendance) had edged ahead of Puerto Ricans (16%) and American Indians (15%), but were still far behind blacks (6%), whites (6%) and Japanese (1%) (69, Table 2.3, p. 12).

Looking at rates of high school completion, since 1960 chicanos have been very near the bottom of all American ethnic groups. In 1960, 34% of chicano males aged 20-24 had completed high school, more than of Puerto Ricans (24%) and American Indian males (33%), but behind blacks (41%), and far behind whites (69%) and Japanese (89%).

By 1970, chicano males (55%) were ahead of only Puerto Ricans (44%) and behind blacks (59%), American Indians (58%) and far behind whites (83%) and Japanese (94%). By 1976, they had the very lowest rate of high school completion (64%), below Puerto Ricans (68%), American Indians (70%), blacks (74%), whites (87%), and Japanese (98%).

Chicanas, too, aged 20-24, have had, along with American Indians and Puerto Ricans, the lowest rates of high school completion since at least 1960; they have had even slightly lower rates of high school graduation than chicano males. In 1960, 35% of them had graduated from high school, above only Puerto Rican women (24%) and below American Indians (29%), blacks (42%), whites (70%), and Japanese (84%). In 1970, chicanas (51%) were

once again ahead only of Puerto Ricans (42%) and behind American Indians (56%), blacks (62%), whites (82%) and Japanese (94%). In 1976, they were tied with American Indians for lowest high school graduation rate, each group having 58%, and had fallen slightly behind Puerto Ricans (60%); they were still far behind blacks (74%), whites (86%), and Japanese (99%) (69, Table 2.3, p. 12).

The above percentages concerning high school graduation are for people aged 20-24. When one looks at percentages of high school graduation for all those 25 years old and over, the results are much the same. According to the 1970 census, only 24% of all chicanos over 25 had graduates from high school, more than only Puerto Ricans (22%), fewer than blacks (31%), and far fewer than whites (57%) and Japanese (69%). Chicanos had even lower high school graduation rates than others with Spanish backgrounds -- their 24% high school completion rate is lower than that for all Americans of Spanish origin (32%), all Spanish-surnamed people of the Southwest (29%) and far below Cubans (44%) (14, Table 5, p. 45).

And these low rates of high school graduation are especially depressing when one considers that "only about one out of four Mexican Americans who receive their high school diplomas enter college" (56, p. 20).

Access to College

As chicanos prepare to enter college, they are different as a group in many important respects from traditional college-bound students. One researcher compared chicano ACT test-takers with tradi-

tional students and found that chicano students were less willing to attend college far from home, less willing to pay a high tuition, more willing to attend a public two-year college and, on the other hand, less willing to attend a private four-year school. They had lower degree aspirations, were more likely to say that they needed remedial help, had lower ACT scores, and came more often from homes where English was not spoken and from families with low incomes (57).

Those are a formidable set of obstacles for any student to overcome, and chicano students have to overcome not only their own backgrounds but also many other factors, associated with the nature and location of American colleges and universities, that hinder their access to higher education. Willingham has identified thirteen factors that reduce access of students, especially students from low SES backgrounds, as chicanos tend to be, to college:

1. Insufficient Colleges. The most common and obvious reason for geographic limitation in the accessibility of higher education is the simple fact that most states do not have enough public colleges to offer proximal education to most residents.

2. Selectivity. In several states selectivity of public institutions has a noticeable effect on accessibility.

3. Tuition Expense. Cost is obviously a major factor in access to higher education.

4. Shortage in the Cities. Three-quarters of the largest urban areas have a major deficiency in accessible higher education.

5. Competing Colleges. Smaller cities with a prominent but relatively inaccessible senior institution frequently lack a free-access college.

6. Minority Balance. There is a wide variety of potential and obvious minority imbalance where various racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic minority groups are less likely to live near an accessible college or vice versa.

7. Segregation. Like minority balance, segregation is a major and general type of restraint reflected in enrollment patterns.

8. Inadequate Programs. Lack of comprehensive programs is an important restraint on the student's interest in higher education and its value to him.

9. Limited Coordination. The quality of statewide coordination can have a critical bearing on various aspects of access to higher education. It is particularly critical in integrated educational-vocational guidance, program articulation among institutions, and the development of mutually beneficial relationships between education and the business community.

10. Underdeveloped Colleges. In many states underdeveloped colleges are a more serious restraint on opportunity than the lack of free-access colleges.

11. Sparse population. Sparsely populated areas are a major problem; they cannot support conventional colleges but have many poor students.

12. Transfer Problems. Inadequate space and aid for transfer students are serious restraints on the spirit and reality of free-access higher education in even the most progressive states.

13. Inadequate information. Since social and political forces provide much of the impetus for what is and is not done in extending educational opportunity, relevant information in the public domain can have an important bearing on legislative and administrative decisions that determine the accessibility of higher institutions. Inadequate information concerning the conditions of educational opportunity has acted as an implicit restraint when inequities have not been revealed (74, pp. 211-214).

In recent years, most colleges in areas with large numbers of Spanish-speaking people have made special attempts to recruit chicano students. One study of college administrators at a sam-

ple of 153 colleges and universities in the southwest United States found that:

> The most frequently used recruiting devices among public colleges in counties having large numbers of Mexican Americans are Mexican American staff, Mexican American students, and special visits to high schools that enroll many Mexican Americans. Spanish language media in communications for recruitment purposes are used regularly by only 14 percent of these colleges (26, p. 1).

Predictors of Chicano College Success

Once chicano students enter college we know, from empirical findings that will be discussed later, that they drop out more often than do other students, tend to major and earn degrees in fields requiring less quantitative rigor than do other students, and go on to graduate and professional school less often than do other students. These facts all suggest that the standard predictors of success in college, predictors that were standardized, for the most part, with white students, do not work very well for chicano students. Indeed, several empirical studies have supported this theory. In the mid-1970s Roy Goldman, with a number of different collaborators, published a series of studies on the relationship between SAT scores and college success. In 1974, he and Regina Richards calculated the regression equations for second quarter freshman grade point averages on SAT scores for both Anglo and chicano students at the University of California at Riverside and found that the regressions differed significantly for the two groups, especially with respect to the weight given the SAT mathematical section. It was a much more important predictor for whites than for chicanos (37, p. 129). The next

year, Goldman and Barbara Hewitt found that the differences between chicanos and whites on the SAT were much greater than differences in the college GPA's that these two groups earned and concluded that therefore SAT scores should not be used in choosing which chicanos should be admitted to college except when high school grades are unavailable (35). In 1976, the same two authors found that predictor variables like high school grade-point average and SAT scores, while they were not particularly good for whites, were even worse for ethnic minority groups, including chicanos, and they recommended that better predictor variables be developed (36). Finally, also in 1976, Goldman and Mel Widawski published a study of Anglo, black, and chicano students enrolled in four major universities during spring quarter, 1974. They concluded that the SAT, combined with other factors, added little to the predictability of college GPA for any of these three groups, and suggested that the SAT should be discontinued, at least for ethnic minority groups (38).

In a similar type of study, this time with students at a nursing program in a large metropolitan hospital, three researchers studied whites, blacks, and chicanos to determine:

> ...the relationship between each of 15 predictor variables (primarily reflecting cognitive abilities and studies skills) and each of 13 criterion measures representing course grades and scores on the National League for Nursing Achievement Tests (41, p. 421).

They found that most of these predictor variables were more effective in predicting success in course grades and the Nursing Achievement Tests for whites than for chicanos and blacks.

Finally, two other investigators, in still another study

intended to determine how well traditional predictor variables, such as the SAT, forecast chicano success in college, found that:

> For 75 Mexican American students in a transition year program at selective private colleges, multiple regression analysis revealed that nontraditional predictors such as low income, English difficulty, denied regular college admission, and high school underachievement with high IQ accounted for more variance in first year college success than did the traditional predictors of the Scholastic Aptitude Test and high school grade averages (51, p. 40).

With so much evidence against the ACT and SAT as predictors of college success for chicanos, the fact that these tests are still so widely used to decide which chicanos will be accepted to college, it is to be expected that many chicanos feel bitter about the widespread use of them. As one of them has eloquently stated:

> The two main instruments used as measuring devices, the standard admission criteria, are the high school grade point average and the SAT or ACT tests. More than anything these instruments serve as screening devices to assure that those that have not mastered the traditional values or folkways of white America do not continue in education. That this is a conscious effort is doubtful; rather, it is a by-product of the racist nature of America. Black Americans, Mexican-Americans and even Poor-White-Trash-Americans are screened out. It's as if elementary and secondary schools were the training ground for becoming a "good white American," and higher education, or the social prestige and economic well-being that accrues to it, becomes the reward for a lesson well learned. To say that this process is not culturally biased and racist is ludicrous in the face of its obviousness (60, p. 131).

College Enrollment

There are not many up-to-date statistics on the enrollment of chicanos in American colleges and universities. Some other-

wise useful data on American higher education, such as those contained in the National Center for Educational Statistics' Condition of Education (1979) and its Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans (1980) very seldom include data on chicanos that are disaggregated from figures on all Hispanic Americans, and since fewer than three out of five Hispanic Americans are chicanos, it is not possible to generalize from one group to the other. In this section, we will discuss chicano enrollment in American higher education from 1968 to some of the most recent available statistics, those available in Alexander Astin et al.'s The American Freshman: Norms for Fall, 1979. In a few instances, we shall report data based on Hispanic-Americans as a whole, if the data are broken down by state and figures are available for states, like California, Texas, and New Mexico, where a very high proportion of Hispanics actually are chicanos.

In Emerging Faces: The Mexican American, Y. Arturo Cabrera showed how small were the percentages of chicanos enrolled at the giant state universities of America's southwest, where millions of chicanos live, as of 1968:

> Mexican American enrollment was as follows: University of California, Berkeley, 496 (1.9 percent); University of Texas at Austin, 838 (3.4%); University of Arizona, Tucson, 1,116 (4.8%); University of Colorado, 249 (1.3 percent); and the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, 1,711 (11.7 percent) (13, p. 62).

Fred Crossland, using 1970 enrollment figures, showed that chicano enrollment needed to increase by 165,000 -- from 50,000 to 215,000, an increase of 330 percent -- for chicanos to be represented in American higher education in proportion to

their numbers (20, p. 16).

A 1972 survey by the College Entrance Examination Board found that:

> In Fall 1971 an estimated 144,000 Mexican Americans were undergraduates in Southwestern colleges. Although this represents a 14 percent increase over the previous Fall, the figures would need to be increased by at least another 100,000 to provide a number proportional to the college-age population (26, p. 1).

The figures on chicano enrollment, distressing as they are, tend to make chicanos' status in American higher education look better than it actually is, for they are disproportionately enrolled in our nation's two-year colleges, the ones, by and large, with the fewest resources to offer students. In four of the five southwestern states where most chicanos live, substantially more chicano full-time freshmen and sophomores attended two-year colleges than did whites. In California 72% of the chicanos, but only 61% of non-Hispanic whites, attended two-year colleges; in Texas, the figures are 55% and 34% respectively; in Colorado, 38% and 22%; in Arizona, 75% and 44%. Interestingly, the fifth state, New Mexico, reverses the pattern, with 14% of its chicanos and 15% of its non-Hispanic whites enrolled in two-year colleges[5] (11, Table 3.14, p. 150).

Not only do chicanos enroll at two-year schools in large numbers, relative to their total enrollment, but far more of

---

[5] These figures, as given by the National Center for Education Statistics, are actually for all Americans of Hispanic background; however, in these five southwestern states, as opposed to states in the East and Midwest, the overwhelmingly majority of Hispanics are chicanos, so the figures are reasonably accurate.

them are enrolled as undergraduates than as graduate or professional school students. In the five southwestern states named above, in fall, 1978 chicanos made up 9.8% of the undergraduate in California, but only 4.1% of the graduate students and 4.7% of students seeking their first professional degree; in Texas, they made up 12.7% of the undergraduates, 6.8% of the graduate students, and 6.4% of the first-professional students; in Colorado, 5.7% of the undergraduates, 3.2% of the graduate students, and 4.1% of the first-professional students; in Arizona, 9.6% of the undergraduates, 2.5% of the graduate students, and 2.1% of the first-professional students; in New Mexico, 26.1% of the undergraduates, 15.3% of the graduate students, and 23.9% of the first-professional students. In no case is there as high a percentage of chicano students in graduate school or working towards their first professional degree as there is of undergraduates; often, indeed, the rates for graduate and professional school attendance are not even half as high[6] (11, Table 3.18, p. 158).

Some of the most recent data about chicano enrollment in American higher education come from Alexander Astin et al.'s American Freshman: National Norms for Fall, 1979 (6). In fall, 1979 1.1% of the full-time, first-time freshman males in United States colleges and universities were chicanos; they were a considerably larger portion of the enrollment of Catholic four-year colleges (4.5%), slightly higher at public two-year colleges

---

[6]Once again, we are using figures for all Hispanics, considering them reasonably reliable -- for these five southwestern states -- as figures for chicanos.

(1.5), and far lower than 1.1% at universities (0.5%), private, nonsectarian colleges (0.7%), and four-year Protestant colleges (0.5%). The profile for chicanas looks much the same. They were 1.2% of the nation's college freshmen, but 4.7% of the freshmen at Catholic four-year colleges and 1.8% at public, two-year colleges. As with chicano men, they were quite under-represented at universities (0.5%), private, nonsectarian colleges (0.5%), and Protestant colleges (0.4%). Combining both sexes, they were 1.2% of U.S. college freshmen, 4.6% of the freshmen at Catholic colleges, 1.7% of the freshmen at public, two-year colleges, but only 0.5% at universities, 0.6% at private, nonsectarian colleges and 0.4% at Protestant colleges.

So far as their geographical distribution is concerned, chicanos are overwhelmingly found in the West, as might be expected. Chicanos, making up 1.2% of American college freshmen, are almost six times as numerous in the West (7.0%), and far less numerous in the East (0.3%), Midwest (0.8%), and South (0.2%).

Looking at their distribution in the hierarchy of American colleges, no clearcut pattern emerges. At highly selective private universities, both men (1.9%) and women (2.0%) are represented well beyond their proportions in all schools combined. At highly selective public universities, however, they are dismally under-represented, with only 0.2% of the men and 0.1% of the women attending these types of schools.

So far as four-year colleges go, they are under-represented in all four strata of private, nonsectarian colleges -- low,

medium, and high selectivity schools. Indeed, chicano representation at all these types of schools seldom rises as high as 50% of their representation in American institutions of higher learning as a whole. They are likewise severely under-represented in medium and high selectivity Catholic colleges, but they are extraordinarily over-represented at low-selectivity Catholic colleges, where they are 11.5% of all students.

So, despite being somewhat over-represented at highly selective private universities, chicanos are found mostly in low selectivity Catholic colleges and two-year public colleges, both of which are types of institution which have less to offer their students than many other types of colleges. In years to come, it is important not only for chicanos to become represented in American higher education according to their numbers, but also for them to be represented in proportion to their numbers throughout the hierarchy of American colleges and not concentrated, as they are now, at some of the lesser types of schools.

College Grade Point Averages

Very little research has been done on the grades of chicano college students. One investigator found that family background factors affecting Mexican-American elementary and high school students seem to have little value in predicting chicano students' success in college as measured by grade point average, and he suggests that present student interactions with family members and peers may account for more variance in college GPA than family background variables (52).

And another researcher, examining the relationship between

the attitudes that economically disadvantaged white, chicano, and black college students perceived their parents as having towards higher education and the college grades these students earned, concluded that the

> ...relationship of perceived parental attitudes and grade point average for Mexican-Americans was significantly different from the similar relationship for the Anglo and Black groups at the .05 level.... The situation may materialize where a given perception of parental attitudes may indicate a different grade point average for various ethnic groups (47, p. 63).

Attrition Rates

Chicanos have very high attrition rates, higher than almost any other ethnic group, throughout their educational careers. Two researchers have recently stated:

> For every 100 Anglo first graders who embark on the educational process that takes them from grade school through college, twenty-four will finish, but only eight blacks out of 100 and five Chicanos out of 100 will complete this same educational process (58, p. 2).

The same researchers, focusing this time on attrition rates in college only, found that:

> ...approximately 50 percent of all students who enter the university system complete their studies and receive four-year degrees. Of all the Anglo students who matriculate, 48 percent graduate. But Mexican Americans who complete a four-year undergraduate program constitute less than a quarter (24%) of those who began (58, p. 2).

A College Entrance Examination Board study reported even gloomier findings, that only one out of every five chicanos who entered college graduated (quoted in 56, p. 20).

Another study, done by the United States Civil Service Commission, found that chicano college students had even higher

attrition rates than Blacks, another group with high dropout rates:

> ...only one in four Mexican-American students who enter college actually graduate, compared with one in two Anglo Americans and one in 3.5 Black Americans (63, p. 7).

A prominent researcher has concluded that the reason why the chicano drop-out rate is so high is due entirely to the type of colleges they attend:

> Chicano college freshmen have a somewhat greater chance of dropping out than do white students or even other ethnic minorities. A closer inspection of the data, however, reveals that this difference is entirely attributable to the heavy concentration of Chicanos in community colleges. Among community college students, Chicanos have the same probability of dropping out as do other students. Among students entering four year colleges and universities, the drop-out rate among Chicanos is actually slightly less than the drop-out rate for other students. These differences dramatize how the demography of Chicanos can affect their subsequent educational attainment (5).

Another scholar, taking a somewhat different approach, focuses not on the types of colleges chicanos attend but on their knowledge of campus life. He argues that:

> Chicanos withdraw from college because they lack knowledge concerning the mundane, everyday world of the university. This knowledge has not been previously made available to them in their high school environment, while other, non-minority, incoming students usually know "the ropes" (48, pp. 7-8).

He follows this assertion with poignant examples of a chicano who endured a racist roommate because he did not know he was allowed to change roommates, a chicana who stayed enrolled in an unsuitable course because when the deadline for changing classes came she did not have the required $3.00 fee and did not

know that it could be postponed or waived, and a chicana who took an "F" in a class because, once enrolled in it, she felt morally obligated to continue in it.

Clearly, the very high chicano drop-out rate is a serious problem.

Chicanos in Graduate and Professional School

Until now almost all the literature we have reviewed has been about chicanos who are undergraduates: sparse as the literature on them is, the literature on chicano graduate and professional school students is even sparser, reflecting, very likely, the fact that chicanos, under-represented as they are among our nation's undergraduate enrollments, are even more under-represented in our nation's graduate schools.

A report prepared for the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education in California (49) found that as of 1970, while chicanos were 5.4% of all undergraduates in the California State University and Colleges system, they were only 3.0% of all full-time graduate or professional school students in that system (p. 70). And while graduate education, even at institutions like those in the CSUC system that don't have law schools and medical schools and don't grant Ph.D.'s, still often takes two or three years, so that one would expect first year graduate students to be only half or less of all graduate students, an amazing 79% of these graduate students were in their first year. This fact suggests that either chicano graduate

students at CSUC campuses have an exceptionally high dropout rate, or that far more had entered in the last year than entered previously, or both.

In the nine-campus University of California system, from 1968 to 1970 chicanos increased their proportions from 1.1% of all graduate students to 2.8% of them (p. 71). In 1970, only about 1,400 of the 49,788 graduate students in California public higher education, or 2.8%, were chicanos. The tiny percentages of chicanos in graduate school are the result of a history of discrimination against them that begins years earlier. As two researchers poignantly state:

> The relative absence of Chicanos as graduate students in our colleges and universities is the final stage in the vicious cycle of the educational underrepresentation of Chicanos which is self-reinforcing, and not apt to change without tremendous effort on the part of policymakers. The first stage of the cycle begins in high school, where the Chicano student often suffers the "disadvantages" of speaking mixed Spanish-English, or English with a Spanish accent. It is continued in high school through the influence of peers "going nowhere" who often attempt to keep their friends from going on to college. The pressures of the family, their financial needs, the frequent parental desire to keep Chicanos near the home, and the cost of higher education also are part of this cycle discouraging the Chicano student from going on to college. And then, even if the desire to attend college develops, the Chicano student must often survive the depressing effects of ignorant counselors or college recruiters who just do not have the time to see them all individually.
>
> The cycle enters the next stage when those few Chicano students who do go on to college enter the white world of the average college campus. Computerized and bureaucratic admissions and enrollment are frustrating to any person, particularly one who doubts whether he belongs on a college campus at all. Finally, there is the shortage of financial aid and other student support services, all working to make the collegiate experience a negative one for Chicano students.

> It is little wonder that so few Chicano students enter graduate school (49, p. 73).

Turning now to national statistics, in 1972-73 chicanos earned 93 of the 20,641 doctorates awarded in America that academic year, or .5%. Their field-by-field distribution was different from that of doctorate-earners as a whole. While 14.8% of all doctorates conferred were in the physical sciences and mathematics, only 12.9% of chicano doctorates were; in engineering, the figures were 7.5% (all doctorates) and 1.1% (chicano doctorates); in the life sciences, 14.2% and 16.1%; in the social sciences, 18.1% and 17.2%; in arts and humanities, 17.0% and 20.4%; and in education, 24.2% and 32.3%. Chicanos thus earned a smaller proportion of their degrees in physical sciences and mathematics, and a far lower percentage of their degrees in engineering, than did others; on the other hand, they earned a far higher percentage in education (50, Table 31, p. 105).

The observation that Carlos Arce has made about ethnic minorities in general is certainly relevant for chicanos:

> Minorities are still clustered in some fields and virtually absent in others. Within disciplines, it is likely that minorities are more often found in the areas of lesser prestige and least often in areas requiring quantitative methodology (3, p. 171).

Taking the years 1973-76 as a group, chicano males earned 514 out of 81,316 doctorates granted to males, or .6%. Chicano females fared slightly worse, earning 110 of 22,847 degrees awarded to females, or .5% (61, Table 5 at the end of the article, no page number).

Attending graduate school as part of a tiny chicano cohort

can scarcely be a pleasant experience for most chicanos. The findings of one writer, published in 1976, about the feelings of UC/Berkeley minority graduate students, very likely reflect the feelings of many chicano graduate students at Berkeley and elsewhere:

> The minority student does not feel that he is treated in an egalitarian fashion by professors. One half the minority students felt that they "rarely" or "never" were treated as an equal compared to one-fourth of the white students (22, p. 235).

Turning now to chicano participation in professional schools, they showed steady year-by-year gains in medical school enrollment throughout the early 1970s. In 1970-71 they were only .4% of American medical students; in 1971-72, .6%; in 1972-73, .8%; in 1973-74, 1.0%; in 1974-75, 1.3% (50, Table 34, p. 111). A study of chicanos in medical schools based on a questionnaire mailed in 1973 to 500 chicano medical school students (46) found that they differed in several important respects from white medical students. More of them tended to be first or second-born (pp. 858-859), a surprising finding, since chicano families, on the average, have more children than white families and thus a smaller proportion of chicano children are first or second-born. Their families earned lower incomes than did the families of white medical students. Their fathers are far less educated than those of white medical students; for example, only 34% of the fathers of chicano medical students, compared with 51% of the fathers of white medical students, had attended college (p. 859).

Chicanos are represented in dental school in even smaller

proportions than in medical school. In 1972-73 they were only .7% of American dental students (compared with .8% of all medical students), and in 1974-75 they were only 1.0% of all dental students (compared with 1.3% of all medical students) (14, Table 29, p. 69).

They are also represented in only minuscule proportions in American law schools. Taking all law schools, whether or not approved by the American Bar Association, as a group, in 1971-72 they were only .9% of the enrollment, in 1972-73 they were 1.1% of the enrollment, and in 1973-74 1.2% of it (50, Table 38, p. 121). By 1976 -- and these figures are for only law schools approved by the American Bar Association, in contrast to the other law school enrollment figures cited earlier -- they were 1488 of the 117,451 American law students, or 1.3% (61, Table 6, at the end of text, un-numbered page).

Affective and Emotional Qualities

To echo a refrain that is heard throughout this literature review, there has not been much published research on the affective and emotional qualities of chicano college students, but we will examine some of the small amount of published literature that does exist. In 1970, Reilly and Knight compared chicanos and non-chicanos at a southwestern university on their scores on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and found that chicanos had higher mean L scores and lower mean Pa scores than non-chicanos. Both differences were significant at the .05 level. There were no significant differences between mean scores on the other 10 MMPI scales (64).

In 1972 Bayer, using data collected by the American Council on Education, found that the chicano college students in his sample had lower degree aspirations than both whites and blacks. Fully 20% of the chicanos he studied, as compared with 11% of the whites and 9% of the blacks, planned as their "highest college degree" either an associate degree or no degree at all. And chicanos, more than whites and blacks, wanted to live at home while they attended college; 21% of the chicano freshmen, compared with only 11% of the black freshmen, said they chose their college because they wanted to live at home (9).

Also in 1972, Hall published an article based on his administration of the 150-item Inventory of Self-Appraisal to lower SES chicanos, lower SES whites, and middle SES whites. He found that five of the six ISA scales differentiated between lower SES chicanos and middle class whites, but only one scale differentiated between lower SES chicanos and middle SES whites. So far as the differences between lower SES chicanos and middle SES whites are concerned:

> Significant ISA scale differences were found for Authority Relationships ($p < .01$), Peer Relationships ($p < .05$), School Related Experiences and Aspirations ($p < .05$), Self Concept ($p < .05$), and Interest Patterns ($p < .01$).

Only in the area of Moral and Social Values were no significant differences found (40, p. 227). But Hall found that:

> ...only ISA School Related Experiences and Aspirations distinguished significantly ($p < .05$) between Mexican-American and Anglo-American lower SES Ss (40, p. 227).

At least two studies have been done on chicano perceptions of the university environment. In 1972, Murray and Pettibone

found that chicano students perceived the university as less scholarly than did Anglo students (59). And in 1973, Garza and Nelson published the results of a CUES test administered to 244 students, mostly whites and chicanos, at Texas A & I University. In findings that conflict with those of Murray and Pettibone's earlier study, they found that chicano students perceived the campus environment as placing a greater emphasis on academic achievement and serious interest in scholarship than did white students (31).

Garza has done several studies on the affective qualities of chicanos in college. In his doctoral dissertation, he found that chicanos differ significantly from Anglos in affective learning style, showing a greater propensity to learn materials they like and less propensity to learn materials they dislike than do whites (29). And in a study he published with Widlak in 1976, the researchers found that there are:

> ...substantial variations in the academic and demographic antecedents of Chicano and Anglo student perceptions of higher education. Age seems to be positively related to favorable Anglo student perceptions, while father's educational level and cumulative grade point average tend to have an adverse effect, i.e., those Anglo students who view the university atmosphere more favorably tend to have less well-educated fathers and lower grade point averages. This is in obvious contrast to the antecedents of the Chicanos with favorable perceptions. Marital status and life-related fields of study seem to be most conducive to positive Chicano student perceptions of the university environment. These basic differences in the prediction systems appear to be a reflection of cultural variations between the two groups (32, p. 297).

In still another set of studies Garza compared chicanos and whites on the subject of locus of control -- that is, to what

extent they felt their lives were largely controlled by fate, luck, chance and, in general, forces beyond their control, and to what extent they felt they were in control of their lives. In the first study, chicano college students tested with Rotter's I-E scale were found to be significantly less external than were whites (30).

In a second study, which factor analyzed the results of the same sample of college students on Rotter's I-E scale, the researchers concluded that the chicanos and whites scored about the same with regard to whether they felt their lives were internally or externally controlled (33). On the basis of these two rigorous studies, Garza takes issue with earlier accounts, which were mostly ethnographic and anthropological, saying that, among other shortcomings, they failed to control for their subjects' SES.

In 1976, Buys, Field, and Schmidt published an article comparing the attitudes towards higher education of low-SES Mexican-American students and their parents. They found that:

> ...low socio-economic (SES) Mexican American students (N = 70) held favorable attitudes toward college education. Students, however, when compared with their parents, held significantly less favorable attitudes toward college education. That over one-half of the students did not plan on attending college reflected this attitude. The discrepancy between the students' attitudes and their parents' attitudes was attributed, in large part, to generational differences. The discrepancy between the students' favorable attitudes toward college and their hesitancy to enroll in college was attributed, in part, to a growing discontentment with college education (12, p. 294).

There have been two recent studies on chicano college students' attitudes and behavior concerning academic and personal

counseling. One, done in 1977 with students at the University of Texas at El Paso, found that chicanos used the counseling center less for personal problems and more for repeated (as opposed to one-time) academic counseling than did whites (56).

Another study, based on a survey of more than 4000 male students at a medium-sized community college in a metropolitan area in the Southwest, compared whites, blacks, and chicanos according to which ethnic group they preferred as counselors. Its authors concluded that:

> ...counselor ethnicity is viewed by male junior college students as a significant variable in counselor selection. This attitude was especially true for Mexican-American and Black students. White students also expressed a preference for a counselor of their ethnic group when faced with a personal problem but not significantly so for the administrative problem. As might be expected, students in general wanted to speak with a same-ethnic-group counselor more for the personal than the administrative situations. Although this was clear for Blacks and Whites, the Mexican-American student chose a Mexican-American counselor despite the kind of problem (34, p. 165).

Finally, in a study of stress in white and chicano college students of both sexes, two recent investigators concluded that:

> Anglo males and females did not differ in their stress intensity patterns, but there were significant stress-intensity differences between Chicanas and Chicanos. In every instance, Chicanas and Chicanos reported higher levels of stress than Anglos, but Chicanas reported highest levels in each instance. Nevertheless, Chicana attrition rates were lower than Chicano rates, suggesting that the women were coping with their stress better than were the men; this evidence was strengthened by the higher academic achievement of Chicanas (58, quoted in 61, p. 15).

This examination of the scanty literature on the affective and emotional development of chicano college students makes it clear that much more research needs to be done. Many of these

studies are based on small samples -- a few hundred students, or even a few dozen -- at one or two schools. Furthermore, they are done at one point in time -- there is very little data showing changes over a period of time. Finally, not surprisingly for studies that are largely cross-sectional and done with very small samples, very few of them appear in major journals, where they are likely to be seen by large numbers of other researchers and where their methodologies and findings can stimulate criticism, debate, and, most important, further work.

CHICANO STUDIES PROGRAMS AND CENTERS

Represented in small numbers and tiny proportions at most colleges and universities, with courses and "majors" that often seem irrelevant to their needs, chicano students often, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, took the initiative to establish chicano studies programs and centers on their campuses, and we will now examine some of the literature about them. Jesus Chavarria, the Director of the Center for Chicano Studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara c. 1974, has defined chicano studies nicely:

> ...the term Chicano studies means the formal study of Chicano culture and of Chicano history in all of its unity and diversity, according to recognizable cultural categories. Chicano studies particularly embrace literature, history, art, philosophy -- or the humanities; and also the social sciences -- sociology, anthropology, economics, and political science. As an educational or curricular approach, the focus is on our peculiar Chicano heritage. This heritage is unique, because, even though it is the product of our Mexican origins, it is more peculiarly the product of our unique cultural and historical experiences in the southwestern part of the United States -- experiences which were par-

> ticularly forged in the crucial nineteenth century out of which we emerged as Chicanos.
>
> Let me add some other observations on the concept of a Chicano studies curriculum. First of all, it is dynamic. It is dynamic in the sense that it is in the process of being made. Second, it seeks new methods of approaching the learning experience. And it particularly attempts to break down the traditional and rigorous roles of teacher and student. It is related, and this is the third point, to identifiable social ends. In other words, it is a curriculum that is directed toward service to our community. Finally, Chicano studies seek the liberation of the individual by striking against the dogmatic, repressive, and culture-bound socializing processes that are implicit to American education today. What we mean by education and what we mean by Chicano studies is <u>freedom</u> (16, p. 175).

So far as the goals of <u>chicano</u> studies programs are concerned, they have been excellently summed up by Juan Gomez-Quiñones, associate professor of history at UCLA, in an article he published in 1974:

> The goal for Chicano Studies is to provide a coherent and socially relevant education, humanistic and pragmatic which prepares Chicanos for service to the Chicano community, and enriches the total society. Students will be prepared to work and live for the purpose of realizing political, social and economic change (39, p. 154).

More specifically, he lists the goals of <u>chicano</u> studies programs as follows:

> (1) The recruitment, admission, and counseling of Chicano students and the recruitment and hiring of Chicano faculty, administrators and staff;
>
> (2) The formal study of Chicano culture and history in all its unity and diversity in terms of recognizable cultural categories;
>
> (3) Support programs for Chicano students;
>
> (4) Chicano research programs;
>
> (5) Chicano publication programs;

(6) Cultural and social action centers in the Chicano community (39, pp. 154-155).

In 1972, Refugio Rochin of the University of California at Davis sent questionnaires to the directors of Chicano studies programs on 29 college and university campuses, receiving replies from 18 of them. He found that courses sponsored by these departments did not seek to reject the dominant white culture, but rather to strengthen the chicano cultural heritage, and that chicano studies programs were latecomers to college campuses, seldom being established until after black studies programs had been founded. He saw considerable diversity among the 18 programs he surveyed:

> Chicano studies programs show some divergence on the things they attempt to do now and the goals that they seek to accomplish in the long run. For some respondents, their programs function simply to organize and to offer a variety of courses dealing with the Chicano and for the benefit of those students who wish to learn more about the Chicano's historical and contemporary presence. But for the most part, Chicano studies programs presently strive for the following: (1) to create an image-building and power-showing instrument which further involves the university with the Chicano community through agency and community sponsored educational projects; (2) to have relevant and scholarly courses which penetrate every pertinent department on the campus; (3) to provide an effective environment for the education of Chicanos and other students who are interested in bilingual, bicultural education; and (4) to encourage and develop research in all areas of knowledge necessary for a better understanding of the Chicano (67, p. 887).

Rochin has adumbrated the general goals of chicano studies programs. For a document that describes in detail the guidelines and philosophy for establishing a particular chicano studies program see El Plan de Santa Barbara: A Chicano Plan for Higher Education (17).

Since a disproportionately large number of chicanos, as discussed earlier, attend two year colleges, these colleges, especially in the Southwest, are often the campuses with the most active and visible chicano studies programs. A doctoral dissertation on chicano access to American colleges and universities has stated that:

> Of the ten programs and services surveyed by CEEB -- college preparatory summer program, peer tutorial assistance, peer counseling services, college-run transportation assistance, veterans assistance services, Chicano studies program, single Chicano studies courses, remedial-developmental courses, academic study skills center, and independent study labs -- community colleges tended to provide more of these services than the 4-year colleges. According to respondents chicano studies courses are offered by about 85 percent of all public colleges in counties with large numbers of Mexican Americans (15, p. 26).

And Michael Olivas, in a study of courses and enrollments in ethnic and racial studies in two-year institutions during the 1972-73 academic year, found that 161 of them offered at least one course in chicano studies and that 36 institutions offered majors in chicano studies. These were fewer institutions than offered at least one course (385) and a major (36) in black studies, but more schools than offered courses and majors in any other kind of ethnic studies, including American Indian, Chinese, Japanese, and Puerto Rican studies (62, Table 4-10, p. 132).

Though there are very few lengthy, full-scale studies of chicano studies programs and centers, such as Daniel Bell has written about general education at Columbia or Joseph Tussman has published on the Tussman program at Berkeley, there are many

brief, vivid, often passionate descriptions of these programs' histories at some campuses. The role the chicano studies center at New Mexico Highlands University played in trying to oust its unpopular (though chicano) president has been vividly narrated by the Chicano Students Committee for Justice at that school (18). And the development of La Raza Studies at Fresno State College, c. 1969-74, has been chronicled by one of its founders (66).

The literature we have reviewed up to now has been passionately in favor of chicano studies centers and most of their activities. But some chicanos have made cogent criticisms of them. One thoughtful observer has criticized them for their growing deradicalization and bureaucratization:

> ...after four years there is disenchantment -- especially among students -- concerning these departments and programs. Why? In looking back, especially on my own experiences in Chicano Studies at San Jose State, and now at San Diego State, one conclusion concerns the fact that the radicalization that initiated Chicano Studies has become deflated; Chicano Studies, in turn, now represents a bureaucratic organization laden with incompetent and opportunistic faculty members whose sense of commitment to the students and to the Chicano Movement leaves much to be desired. This situation developed because when these departments started, only a few Chicanos held the credentials (MA or PhD) to staff them. These Mexican-Americans, who suddenly discovered their Chicanismo, moved directly into positions of responsibility in these programs, and while they can be as radical as possible to begin these departments and to maintain them, their radicalization goes no further; for if they make more movidas against the administration, their good salaries and the funding (in some cases quite heavy, as at San Diego State) of "their" departments might be jeopardized -- and, above all, they stand to lose their jobs (28, p. 352).

And Richard Rodriguez, in a famous article in Change three

years ago, excoriated programs that offer services and support indiscriminately to all chicanos in college, even those, like Rodriguez, who scarcely need them:

> The strategy that permitted someone like me to become a minority student left the most urgent business of social reform unfinished (68, p. 31).

Finally, the prominent writer Carlos Arce, in a well-known recent article, has argued that the situation of chicanos in American schools, including colleges and universities, is one of "academic colonialism," which he defines as:

> ...the selective imposition of intellectual premises, concepts, methods, institutions, and related organizations on a subordinate group and/or the unselective and uncritical adoption and imitation of the intellectual premises, concepts, methods, institutions, and organizations of other groups by selected members of a subordinate group, with the selection process not being in the control of the subordinate group (1, p. 77).

Seeing chicanos in American education as suffering under academic colonialism, Arce sees even such chicano-organized and led programs as chicano studies as marginal institutions:

> The most prominent feature of the Chicano experience with higher education is its peripheralness relative to the overall academic enterprise. Whether one refers to Chicano institutions or Chicano programs or Chicano personnel or students, the norm is for the organizational loci of them to be in the periphery, in terms of participation in governance, academic credibility, recognition and status, resource allocation, permanence, and facilities (1, p. 86).

But this view may be an excessively gloomy one. At their best, chicano studies programs and centers have much to offer their students and communities. To look through a recent issue of El Mirlo, the newsletter of the UCLA Chicano Studies Center, and to see its articles on the center's many research activities,

its publications, its public service programs, its library holdings, its chicano studies courses, its fellowships, and its postdoctoral and visiting scholars is to realize that such centers can make a vital contribution to the lives of chicano college students and the chicano community (24).

COLLEGES ATTENDED BY LARGE NUMBERS OF CHICANOS

Having examined chicano studies centers and programs, we turn now to colleges that have substantial chicano enrollments. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, in fall, 1978 there were 13 colleges in the United States where more than 51% of the students were chicanos -- nine in Texas, two in California, one in New Mexico, and one in Oregon (11, Table 3.15, p. 152). Some of these are large comprehensive colleges like Pan American University, Texas (71% chicano enrollment) and Texas A & I University (51% chicano enrollment), while some are two-year colleges, like Laredo Junior College (Texas), with the highest percentage of chicano students of any college in the United States (87%) and East Los Angeles College (66%). Some are among the most marginal institutions of higher education in the United States, like DQ University, which, despite its name, has fewer than 150 students, and Colegio Cesar Chavez, in Mt. Angel, Oregon, which has fewer than 40.

In addition, there are some other colleges that have very large numbers of chicanos enrolled, even though they are not a majority of the student body, such as the University of Texas at El Paso, with 5900 chicano students (38% of its enrollment), the

University of New Mexico, with 4900 chicano students (22% of enrollment), and California State University at Los Angeles, with 4700 chicano students (20% of enrollment) (11, Table 3.16, p. 154).

Colleges and universities with large chicano enrollments are very different from the historically black colleges. There are about 100 colleges and universities in the United States that have historically served blacks, located not only in more than ten southern states but also in Ohio and Pennsylvania. By contrast, nine of the 13 colleges that have enrollments more than 50% chicano are in one state (Texas), and seven of the eight colleges that enroll more than 4000 chicano students are in just two states (Texas and California). Many historically black colleges are more than 100 years old, some are quite large, and there are historically black medical schools, law schools, and even an historically black research university (Howard). By contrast, the colleges that were established primarily for chicanos, whether independent institutions or "cluster" colleges within larger universities, are almost invariably small, undergraduate schools fewer than 20 years old. While for years many black colleges and universities have been controlled primarily by blacks, most schools with large enrollments are administered largely by whites, a point that Carlos Arce has made:

> Except for a few fragile institutions established in the past decade, there has for some time been a small number of mostly teacher-training regional colleges, such as Pan American, Texas A and I, and New Mexico Highlands, which have enrolled significant numbers of Chicanos. However, these have never been controlled, administered, or even primarily staffed by Chicanos. Only one has had a Chicano president,

> and none has ever had a Chicano majority among the upper echelon of administrators or on the faculty (3, p. 169).

A writer for the Chronicle of Higher Education has recently pointed out:

> ...until the era of the civil rights movement, Mexican-Americans -- like blacks -- were often excluded from higher education, but -- unlike blacks -- they received no support for developing their own colleges and universities (54, p. 8).

Turning now to the literature on individual colleges and universities with large chicano enrollments, we are struck by its meager quantity and indifferent quality. Not only are there no really major works on chicano-dominated colleges, such as Samuel Eliot Morrison has written about Harvard or Martin Duberman about North Carolina's Black Mountain College, but there are few long, substantial pieces, such as David Riesman has written about Harvard or Riesman and Christopher Jencks about San Francisco State College. There is even a paucity of long, carefully done, chapter-length pieces, such as the 17 sketches in Riesman and Vernon Stadtman's Academic Transformation.

Much of the existing literature seems to consist of short descriptions or historical narratives of particular colleges, without a great deal of analysis or interpretation, and we will very briefly mention some of them. Thomas Cottle, the distinguished psychologist, has published a sketch of Adams State College, a school located in the San Luis Valley of Colorado, an area which is at least 50% chicano, but where the student body is only 16% chicano (19). Peter Janssen has written about DQ University in Davis, California, a unique school that is about

60% chicano and 40% American Indian. His piece is wholly uncritical, with an "us against them" point of view, and his final paragraph can serve to indicate the tone of his article:

> The key to DQ is its emphasis on meeting each student where he is -- and then helping him get where he wants to go. "DQ is a place where Chicanos and Indians can come and blossom like flowers," says Executive Director Clifford. "The students are finding their own cultural identity. From now on DQ will be a place where people can come and learn the things they really want to learn -- not the things the dominant white system imposes on them" (44, p. 48).

A brief piece on New Mexico Highlands University and the College of Santa Fe, both in New Mexico, appeared in Intellect in 1973; it briefly traces their histories and their sources of income (43).

Marrio Barrera has written "The Struggle for Third College at UC San Diego," tracing the movement that led to the college's establishment and the history of the college's early years (7). Peter Janssen, whose article on DQ University was cited above, has also provided a brief piece on UC San Diego's Third College, discussing its history, curriculum, and financial arrangements (45). The anthology that contains Janssen's article on UCSD also contains a piece on Pima College, a two-year community college in Tucson, Arizona that is devoted to the concept of pluralistic culture and has an intercultural committee made up of Indians, chicanos, whites, and blacks (23).

And Change has published a piece on tiny Colegio Cesar Chavez in Mt. Angel, Oregon, its struggle throughout the early and mid-1970s to stay alive, and its continuing battles with the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Depart-

ment of Housing and Urban Development (55).

THE LITERATURE ABOUT CHICANOS IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION -- A CRITIQUE

Now that we have surveyed some of the literature about chicanos in American higher education, it is appropriate to comment on that literature itself. It is not, taken as a whole, an extremely impressive body of literature. For one thing, there is not nearly enough of it. As of March, 1978 there were 7,151,000 chicanos in the United States, (11, Table 1.01, p. 6) about one-fourth as many as blacks. Chicanos are increasing in numbers much faster than are blacks, and, because as a group they are younger, a greater proportion of them will turn 18 years old in the next few years, the age when people traditionally start college. Yet far more has been written about blacks in American higher education than about chicanos. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, later the Carnegie Council on Higher Education, has not sponsored even one volume on chicanos among the dozens of books it has published on American higher education.

Not only is the literature on chicanos in higher education sparse, but it is often published in obscure, difficult-to-find sources, such as master's theses, unpublished doctoral dissertations, the Educational Resource and Information Clearinghouse (ERIC) system, chicano studies centers' documents, government reports, and so on. There is relatively little about chicanos in books published by university and commercial presses and very little in major journals. To look through the immense, 774-item

bibliography by Arce and Leggett (4) is to be momentarily impressed with the abundance of material on chicanos, until one tries to find this material. This writer, working on this literature review at a university whose library system holds more than four million volumes and subscribes to some 50,000 periodicals, which has a chicano studies center with its own library, and which is located in the city with America's largest chicano population, was astounded that so many sources listed in the Arce and Leggett bibliography and other standard bibliographies simply could not be found.[7]

A third shortcoming of the literature is that it often refers to Hispanic-Americans as a group, without disaggregating. The National Center for Educational Statistics' Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans (11), which, in other ways, is an outstanding reference work, containing more than 260 pages of data, contains very few tables, in its section on higher education, that show separate statistics for chicanos. Since the category "Hispanic Americans" includes not only chicanos but people who came to the United States from Puerto Rico, South America, Central America, Haiti, Cuba, Spain and elsewhere, and chicanos are fewer than 60% of this group, one cannot infer very much about chicanos from looking at statistics on Hispanic-Americans as a whole.

---

[7]Of course, it could be argued that the reason the material was impossible to find is not because it is fugitive or ephemeral, but simply because the university library system has not made sufficient effort to acquire it.

A fourth shortcoming of the literature -- and now we are referring specifically to the research literature -- about chicanos is higher education is that the empirical studies tend to be done on a very small scale, based on a few dozen or a few hundred subjects or respondents from one or a few schools. In addition, most of the studies are cross-sectional, thereby failing to show how whatever is being studied has changed over time. Future empirical work on chicanos should use larger samples, drawn from larger populations, and should be, wherever possible, longitudinal.

Still another unfortunate characteristic of much writing on chicanos in higher education -- and here we refer not to "research" studies but to the descriptive and historical accounts of individual colleges or chicano studies programs that we have discussed in an earlier section of this review -- is that it is not analytical or interpretive enough. It typically gives an account of, say, the struggle to establish a chicano studies program or such a program's first few years, without placing these events in a larger context. And these narrative and descriptive accounts, whether written by whites or chicanos, are often too simplistic, pitting the selfless, noble chicanos against the reactionary college administrators. One hopes that future accounts will be fuller and richer than most of the existing ones, and will not discuss the establishment, say, of chicano studies centers in such stark terms of good and evil.

Finally, with all the empirical studies published in minor journals or not published at all, with all the narratives put

out by chicano studies centers and campus commissions on the status of chicanos and chicano studies programs on a particular campus, there is a great need for book-length integrative studies that tie all this material together. Such studies could either be inventories of research findings, like Feldman and Newcomb's Impact of College on Students (25) and Bowen's Investment in Learning (10) or they could be long, historical narratives. It would be desirable for someone to do for chicanos in American higher education what Weinberg has done for several races in his history of race and education in the United States (73), or, on a more modest level, what Hendrick has done for elementary and secondary education in California in Education for Non-whites in California, 1849-1970 (42).

As chicanos have grown in numbers and influence in America and in American higher education, as chicano studies programs and centers have been burgeoning throughout the land, so too must the literature about chicanos in American higher education increase, in years to come, in size, excellence, and influence.

REFERENCES

1. Arce, Carlos H. "Chicano Participation in Academe: A Case of Academic Colonialism," Grito del Sol: A Chicano Quarterly, vol. 3, no. 1, January/March, 1978, pp. 75-104.

2. Arce, Carlos H. "Chicanos in Higher Education," Integrated Education, vol. 14, no. 3, May-June, 1976, pp. 14-18.

3. Arce, Carlos H. "Minorities in Higher Education: Recent Advances and Current Problems," in Smith, Cynthia (ed. by), Advancing Equality of Opportunity: A Matter of Justice (Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Educational Policy), 1978, pp. 165-175.

4. Arce, Carlos H. and Delia C. Leggett, "Chicanos in Higher Education: A Bibliography," Survey Research Center, U. of Michigan, 1974.

5. Astin, Alexander. "Equality of Access for Chicanos in Higher Education," in M. Perez (ed. by) Institute on Chicanos in Higher Education (Pasadena, CA.: National Association for Equal Educational Opportunities), 1977.

6. Astin, Alexander W., Margo R. King, and Gerald T. Richardson, The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall, 1979 (Los Angeles: Graduate School of Education, UCLA), 1980.

7. Barrera, Mario. "The Struggle for Third College at UC San Diego," Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education (Hayward, CA.: Southwest Network of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers), 1974, pp. 62-68.

8. Barron, Jose (Pepe). "Chicanos in the Community College," Junior College Journal, vol. 42, no. 9, June/July, 1972, pp. 23-26.

9. Bayer, Alan E. The Black College Freshman: Characteristics and Recent Trends, American Council on Education Research Report 7: 3 (Washington: American Council on Education), 1972.

10. Bowen, Howard R. Investment in Learning (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass), 1977.

11. Brown, George H., Nan L. Rosen, Susan T. Hill, and Michael A. Olivas, The Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics), 1980.

12. Buys, Christian J., Thomas K. Field, and Michael M. Schmidt. "A Comparison of Low Socio-economic Mexican American Students'

and Parents' Attitudes toward College Education," Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, vol. 2, no. 3, summer, 1976, pp. 294-298.

13. Cabrera, Y. Arturo. Emerging Faces: The Mexican American (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company), 1971.

14. Cabrera, Y. Arturo. Minorities in Higher Education: Chicanos and Others (Niwot, Colorado: Sierra Publications), 1978.

15. Cardenas, Isaac. Equality of Educational Opportunity: A Descriptive Study on Mexican American Access to Higher Education, University of Massachusetts at Amherst Ed.D. Dissertation (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms), 1974.

16. Chavarria, Jesus. "Chicano Studies," in Robert A. Altman and Patricia O. Snyder (ed. by), The Minority Student on the Campus: Expectations and Possibilities (Berkeley, CA.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, and Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education), 1970, pp. 173-178.

17. Chicano Coordinating Committee on Higher Education, El Plan de Santa Barbara: A Chicano Plan for Higher Education (Santa Barbara: La Causa Publications), October, 1969.

18. Chicano Students Committee for Justice, "Chicano Demonstrations at New Mexico Highlands University," Parameters for Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education (Hayward, CA.: Southwest Network of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers), 1974, pp. 33-40.

19. Cottle, Thomas J. "Run to Freedom: Chicanos and Higher Education," Change, vol. 4, no. 1, February, 1972, pp. 34-41.

20. Counting the Forgotten. The 1970 Census Count of Persons of Spanish Speaking Backgrounds in the United States. A Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, April, 1974.

21. Crossland, Fred E. Minority Access to College: A Ford Foundation Report (New York: Shocken Books), 1971.

22. Duncan, Birt L. "Minority Students," in Joseph Katz and Rodney T. Hartnett, Scholars in the Making: The Development of Graduate and Professional Students (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company), 1976, pp. 227-242.

23. Egerton, John. "Pima College," in Laurence Hall and Associates, New Colleges for New Students (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass), 1974, pp. 136-149.

24. El Mirlo: Chicano Studies Research Center Newsletter, UCLA, vol. 7, nos. 1 and 2, September-December, 1979.

25. Feldman, Kenneth A. and Theodore M. Newcomb, The Impact of College on Students, volumes 1 and 2 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass), 1969.

26. Ferrin, Richard I., Richard W. Jonsen, and Cesar M. Trimble, Access to College for Mexican Americans in the Southwest, Higher Education Surveys Report no. 6 (Palo Alto, CA.: College Entrance Examination Board), July, 1972.

27. Fogartie, Ruth Ann Douglas. "Spanish-Name People in Texas with Special Emphasis on Those Who are Students in Texas Colleges and Universities," master's thesis, University of Texas, 1948.

28. Garcia, Mario T. "The Chicano University," in Ralph Poblano (ed. by), Ghosts in the Barrio: Issues in Bilingual-Bicultural Education (San Farale, CA.: Leswing Press), 1973, pp. 349-356.

29. Garza, Raymond T. "Affective and Associative Meaningfulness in the Learning Style of Chicano and Anglo College Students," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1975.

30. Garza, Raymond T. and Russell E. Ames, Jr. "A Comparison of Anglo- and Mexican-American College Students on Locus of Control," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, vol. 42, no. 6, 1974, p. 919.

31. Garza, Raymond T. and Darwin B. Nelson, "A Comparison of Mexican- and Anglo-American Perceptions of the University Environment," Journal of College Student Personnel, vol. 14, no. 5, September, 1973, pp. 399-401.

32. Garza, Raymond T. and Frederic T. Widlak, "Antecedents of Chicano Student Perceptions of the University Environment," Journal of College Student Personnel, vol. 17. no. 4, July, 1976, pp. 395-399.

33. Garza, Raymond T. and Frederic W. Widlak, "The Validity of Locus of Control Dimensions for Chicano Populations," Journal of Personality Assessment, vol. 41, no. 6, 1977, pp. 635-643.

34. Gilsdorf, Dale L. "Counselor Preference of Mexican-American, Black, and White Community College Students," Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance, vol. 6, no. 4, July, 1978, pp. 162-168.

35. Goldman, Roy D. and Barbara Newlin Hewitt, "An Investigation of Test Bias for Mexican-American College Students," Journal of Educational Measurement, vol. 12, no. 3, fall, 1975, pp. 187-196.

36. Goldman, Roy D. and Barbara Newlin Hewitt, "Predicting the

Success of Black, Chicano, Oriental and White College Students," Journal of Educational Measurement, vol. 13, no. 2, summer, 1976, pp. 107-117.

37. Goldman, Roy D. and Regina Richards, "The SAT Prediction of Grades for Mexican-American Versus Anglo-American Students at the University of California, Riverside," Journal of Educational Measurement, vol. 11, no. 2, summer, 1974, pp. 129-135.

38. Goldman, Roy D. and Mel H. Widawski, "An Analysis of Types of Errors in the Selection of Minority College Students," Journal of Educational Measurement, vol. 13, no. 3, fall, 1976, pp. 185-200.

39. Gomez-Quiñones, Juan. "To Leave to Hope of Chance: Propositions on Chicano Studies, 1974," Parameters for Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education (Hayward, CA.: Southwest Network of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers), 1974, pp. 153-166.

40. Hall, Lincoln H. "Personality Variables of Achieving and Non-Achieving Mexican-American and Other Community College Freshmen," Journal of Educational Research, vol. 65, no. 5, January, 1972, pp. 224-228.

41. Haney, Russell, William B. Michael, and John Martois, "The Prediction of Success of Three Ethnic Groups in the Academic Components of a Nursing-Training Program at a Large Metropolitan Hospital," Educational and Psychological Measurement, vol. 36, no. 2, 1976, pp. 421-431.

42. Hendrick, Irving G. The Education of Non-Whites in California, 1849-1970 (San Francisco: R&E Research Associates), 1977.

43. "Higher Education for Indians and Spanish-Speaking Americans," Intellect, vol. 101, #2346, January, 1973, pp. 208-209.

44. Janssen, Peter. "Their Own Place in the Sun," Change, vol. 5, no. 1, February, 1973, pp. 45-48.

45. Janssen, Peter A. "Third College," in Laurence Hall and Associates, New Colleges for New Students (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass), 1974, pp. 149-156.

46. Kaufert, Joseph. "A Preliminary Study of Mexican-American Medical Students," Journal of Medical Education, vol. 50, no. 9, September, 1975, pp. 856-866.

47. Leman, Kevin, "Parental Attitudes," NASPA Journal, vol. 13, no. 3, winter, 1976, pp. 61-63.

48. Leon, David Jess. "Chicano College Dropouts and the Educational Opportunity Program: Failure After High School?", High

School Behavioral Science, vol. 3, no. 1, fall, 1975, pp. 6-11.

49. López, Ronald W. and Darryl D. Enos, Chicanos and Public Higher Education in California (Sacramento, CA.: Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education), 1972.

50. López, Ronald W., Arturo Madrid-Berela, and Reynaldo Flores Macías, Chicanos in Higher Education: Status and Issues, Monograph no. 7, Chicano Studies Center Publications, UCLA, 1976.

51. Lowman, Robert P. and Dennis W. Spuck, "Predictors of College Success for the Disadvantaged Mexican-American," Journal of College Student Personnel, vol. 16, no. 1, January, 1975, pp. 40-48.

52. McNamara, Patrick H. "Some Factors Associated with Differential Grade Performance of Mexican Americans and non-Mexican American College Students," paper presented at annual meetings of the Southwestern Social Science Association, Dallas, Texas, March, 1970.

53. Manuel, Herschel T. The Education of Mexican and Spanish-speaking Children in Texas (Austin: Fund for Research in the Social Sciences, U. of Texas), 1930.

54. Middleton, Lorenzo. "Hispanics on the Campuses: A Long Way to Go," Chronicle of Higher Education, vol. 20, no. 14, June 2, 1980, pp. 1; 8-10.

55. Mitzman, Barry. "Si Se Puende -- It Can be Done!," Change, vol. 8, no. 4, May, 1976, pp. 16-19.

56. Muhs, William F., Garry E. Popp, and Herman F. Patterson, "The Mexican American in Higher Education: Implications for Educators," in Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 58, no. 1, September, 1979, pp. 20-24.

57. Munday, Leo A. "College Access for Nontraditional Students," Journal of Higher Education, vol. 47, no. 6, November/December, 1976, pp. 681-699.

58. Munoz, Daniel G. and Betty Garcia-Bahne, A Study of the Chicano Experience in Higher Education. Unpublished study funded by the Center for Minority Group Mental Health Programs of the National Institute for Mental Health, San Diego, CA., 1978.

59. Murray, W.R. and T.J. Pettibone, "Mexican-American and Anglo-American Perceptions of a University Environment." Paper presented at the Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Las Cruces, New Mexico, November, 1972.

60. Nunez, Rene. "Recruitment and Admission of Minority Students: The Glaring Reality," in Robert A. Altman and Patricia O. Snyder (ed. by), The Minority Student on the Campus: Expectations and Possibilities (Berkeley, CA.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, and Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education), 1970, pp. 127-140.

61. Olivas, Michael A. "Hispanics in Higher Education: Status and Legal Issues," a paper presented to the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, Bal Harbour, Florida, October 4, 1978.

62. Olivas, Michael A. The Dilemma of Access: Minorities in Two Year Colleges (Washington, D.C.: Howard U. Press), 1979.

63. Pesqueira, Richard E. "Mexican American Student (Staying) Power in College," College Board Review, #90, winter, 1973-74, pp. 6-9; 26-28.

64. Reilly, Robert R. and Glenn E. Knight, "MMPI Scores of Mexican-American College Students," Journal of College Student Personnel, vol. 11, no. 6, November, 1970, pp. 419-422.

65. Report of the President's Task Force on Chicanos and the University of California (No publisher: no place listed), 1975.

66. Risco, Eliezer. "Before Universidad de Aztlan: Ethnic Studies at Fresno State College," Parameters for Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education (Hayward, CA.: Southwest Network of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers), 1974, pp. 41-47.

67. Rochin, Refugio I. "The Short and Turbulent Life of Chicano Studies: A Preliminary Study of Emerging Programs and Problems," Social Science Quarterly, vol. 53, no. 4, March, 1973, pp. 884-894.

68. Rodriguez, Richard. "Beyond the Minority Myth," Change, vol. 10, no. 8, September, 1978, pp. 28-34.

69. Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women: A Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, August, 1978.

70. United Mexican American Students at UCLA, "Retention of the Chicano Student as a Comprehensive Program Unit of the Mexican American Student Organization," in Manuel H. Guerra and others, The Retention of Mexican American Students in Higher Education with Special Reference to Bicultural and Bilingual Problems, May, 1969.

71. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Mexican-American Educational Study,

Report VI (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1973-74.

72. Vils, Ursula. "Chicanas Stand Up and Speak Out," Los Angeles Times, June 23, 1980, part 5, p. 1.

73. Weinberg, Meyer. A Chance to Learn: A History of Race and Education in the United States (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press), 1977.

74. Willingham, Warren W. Free-Access Higher Education (New York: The College Entrance Examination Board), 1970.

75. Zeleny, Carolyn. "Relations Between the Spanish-Americans and Anglo-Americans in New Mexico: A Study of Conflict and Accommodation in a Dual-Ethnic Situation," doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1944.